

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 18-20, 30 and 31 have been amended. Claims 32-36 have been added. Claims 1-12, 18-23, 25, 26, 30-36 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 101 Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 18-20, in an effort to expedite prosecution. Applicants submit that claims 18-20 recite statutory subject matter. Removal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-12, 18-23, 25-26 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Durham (U.S. Patent 6,330,566)(hereinafter “Durham”) in view of Cui et al. (U.S. Patent 6,910,180) (hereinafter “Cui”) and further in view of Farber et al. (U.S. Patent 6,185,598) (hereinafter “Farber”). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

With regard to amend claim 1, the cited art does not teach or suggest at least the feature of *sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client, the redirection request comprising an indicator that redirection has occurred, wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier*. The Office Action relies on col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 13 of Dunham in rejecting similar features of the previously submitted claims. (Office Action, page 2). More specifically, the Office Action appears to take the position that the cookie of Durham is analogous to both, the claimed visitor identifier and the claimed indicator that redirection has occurred. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited portion of Durham discloses a client contacting a server, and a test to determine whether the client sent the server a client cookie. (Durham, col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 13). If the client sent the server a client cookie, then client configuration information is retrieved. *Id.* If the client did not send the server a client cookie, then a new database record is created and a new cookie is initialized. *Id.* Further, the cookie is sent to the client so that a personalized page can be generated. *Id.* Accordingly, Durham merely discloses sending a cookie to a client. Durham, however, does not disclose sending both, a new visitor identifier (e.g., a cookie) and a separate indicator that redirection has occurred. In fact, Durham provides no teaching or suggestion of providing a redirection, much less any indicator that a redirection has occurred. The Office Action appears to suggest that the cookie itself is indicative of a redirection. Applicant disagrees. A redirection request indicates to the client rendering the web page that a requested resource can be found at an address. (Applicants’ Specification, para. [0012]). Durham merely discloses that the cookie is sent so that a personalized page can be generated for the client. Durham does not provide any indication that the disclosed cookie includes a redirection request, much less that the cookie is indicative of a redirection having occurred. Thus, Durham does not disclose an indicator that a redirection has occurred. In any event, Durham, does not disclose sending both, a new visitor identifier (e.g., a cookie) and a separate indicator that redirection has occurred. The other cited art does not appear to remedy this deficiency. Accordingly, Durham taken alone or in hypothetical combination with the other cited art does not disclose “sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client, the redirection request comprising an indicator that redirection has occurred, wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier,” in combination with other features of the claim.

In the response to arguments section of the prior Office Action states:

As to point (A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Durham clearly teaches that after redirection, the request is updated to indicate that the operation has occurred by assigning a cookie and accordingly such assignment does not need to happen again,

because the server checks for "the indicator" (*the cookie*) (column 7, lines 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2, item 102). In other words, if a client was assigned a cookie and redirected, then the presence of such a cookie is clearly an indicator that redirection has occurred. Or else, Durham's system would enter an infinite loop if it were not for the test at Figure 2, item 102 and the system would re-assign a cookie to the request over and over again. (Office Action, page 2) (emphasis added)

As to point (B), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Durham clearly teaches determining whether "indicator" (*the cookie*) is included in a received request (column 7, lines 64 - column 8, line 14, Fig. 2, item 102). (Office Action, page 3) (emphasis added)

As to point (C), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Durham teaches checking to see if a cookie is present (column 7, lines 64 - column 8, line 14, Fig. 2, item 102), if it is determined that such a cookie is present then it clearly determines that a cookie has been previously sent, or else there would be no cookie present and the server would assign a new cookie to the client and redirect the client to the customized page (column 7, lines 64 - column 8, line 14, Fig. 2, item 102). (Office Action, page 3) (emphasis added)

Thus, the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action appears to explicitly take the position that the cookie of Durham is analogous to both, the claimed visitor identifier and the claimed indicator that redirection has occurred. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, a redirection request indicates to the client rendering the web page that a requested resource can be found at an address. (Applicants' Specification, para. [0012]). Durham merely discloses that the cookie is sent so that a personalized page can be generated for the client. Durham does not provide any indication that the disclosed cookie includes a redirection request, much less that the cookie is indicative of a redirection having occurred. Thus, Durham does not disclose an indicator that a redirection has occurred. In any event, Durham, does not disclose sending both, a new visitor identifier (e.g., a cookie) and a separate indicator that redirection has occurred.

Further, with regard to amend claim 1, the cited art does not teach or suggest at least the feature of *responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers*. As discussed above, Durham merely discloses that the cookie is sent so that a personalized page can be generated for the client. Durham does not provide any indication that the disclosed cookie includes a redirection request, much less that the cookie is indicative of a redirection having occurred. The other cited art does not remedy the deficiency. Cui merely describes a technique for removing cookies from web page response headers and storing the cookies in a repository for later use. Farber merely describes techniques for intercepting resource request from clients, and selectively reflecting such requests to repeaters.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claims 3, 11, 18 and 19 include features similar to those discussed above. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 11, 18 and 19 are allowable over the cited art for at least reasons similar to those discussed above.

Applicants also assert that the rejections of numerous ones of the dependent claims are further unsupported by the cited art. Since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

New Claims

New claim 32 recites: “The method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving another request for a resource, the another request originating at a client; determining that the another request for the resource does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred; responsive to determining that the

another request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier; sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client, the redirection request comprising an indicator that redirection has occurred, wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier; determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request; responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers; and transmitting the requested resource to the client.” The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 33 recites: “The method of claim 3, further comprising: d.) receiving another request for a resource from a requestor, the requestor having an address; e.) determining that the another request does not include a visitor identifier; f.) responsive to determining that the another request does not include a visitor identifier: f.1) determining that the another request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed; f.2) responsive to determining that the request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address; determining that the requestor does not accept visitor identifiers; and transmitting the requested resource to the requestor.” The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 34 recites: “The data collection server of claim 11, wherein the cookie handler coupled to the communications interface for performing the further steps of: b.3) responsive to determining that the request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address; determining that the requestor does not accept visitor identifiers; and causing the communication interface to transmit the requested resource to the requestor.” The cited

art does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 35 recites: “The computer readable storage medium of claim 18, further comprising the steps of: responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers.” The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 36 recites: “The computer readable storage medium of claim 19, further comprising the steps of: c.3) responsive to determining that the request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address; determining that the requestor does not accept visitor identifiers; and transmitting the requested resource to the requestor.” The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature, in combination with the other features of the claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6067-47301/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: April 8, 2010